STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ALLOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT -- [M-02-1486PJH]

WHEREAS, defendants Mosel Vitelic Inc., and Mosel Vitelic Corporation were 1 2 mistakenly named as Mosel Vitelic Corporation and Mosel Vitelic Corporation (USA), 3 respectively, in the Third Amended Consolidated Complaint; WHEREAS, plaintiffs desire to file a Corrected Third Amended Consolidated Complaint 4 5 to cure this deficiency; 6 WHEREAS, no defendant shall be required to file an answer to the Corrected Third 7 Amended Consolidated Complaint. Each defendant's last-filed answer shall be deemed to be its 8 answer to the Corrected Third Amended Consolidated Complaint. 9 THEREFORE, the parties hereby stipulate as follows: 10 Plaintiffs may file a Corrected Third Amended Consolidated Complaint, a true and correct 11 copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. 12 DATED: February 8, 2007 **WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER** FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 13 FRANCIS A. BOTTINI, JR. 14 15 16 FRANCIS A. BOTTINI. IR 17 Symphony Towers 18 750 B Street, Suite 2770 19 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/239-4599 20 Facsimile: 619/234-4599 21 Guido Saveri 22 Cadio Zirpoli SAVERI & SAVERI, INC. 23 111 Pine Street, Suite 1700 San Francisco, CA 94111 24 Telephone: 415/217-6810 25 Facsimile: 415/217-6813 26 27 28

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ALLOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED

COMPLAINT -- [M-02-1486PJH]

- 1 -

Case 4:02-md-01486-PJH Document 1359 Filed 02/20/07 Page 3 of 39

02-07-2007	1:07am From-WOLF HALDENSTEIN	1-619-234-4 599 T- 465 P.008/007 F-7 39
1 2	DATED: February, 2007	Howard Uliman Robert E. Freitas ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 5 6		HOWARD ULLMAN 1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025 Attorneys for Defendants Nanya Technology
7 8 9 10	DATED: February 8, 2007	Corporation and Nanya Technology Corporation USA Joel S. Sanders GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
11 12 13 14		JOEL S. SANDERS One Montgomery Street, 31st Street San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: 415/393-8200 Facsimile: 415/986-5309
15 16 17 18		Ronald C. Redcay ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 177 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: 213/243-4000 Facsimile: 213/243-4199
19 20 21 22	DATED: February, 2007	Attorneys for Defendants Micron Technology, Inc. and Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc. James G. Kreissman Harrison J. Frahn IV Jason M. Bussey SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
23 24 25 26		HARRISON J. FRAHN IV 2550 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: 650/251-5000 Facsimile: 650/251-5002
27 _. 28	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] OF COMPLAINT — [M-02-1486PJH]	Attorneys for Defendants Elpida Memory (USA), Inc. and Elpida Memory, Inc. RDER ALLOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED

		-
1	DATED: February <u>8</u> , 2007	Howard Ullman
1 2		Robert E. Freitas ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
3		Howard Ullman /FAB
4		HOWARD ULLMAN
5		1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025
6		Attorneys for Defendants Nanya Technology
7		Corporation and Nanya Technology Corporation USA
8 9	DATED: February, 2007	Joel S. Sanders GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP
10		
11		JOEL S. SANDERS
12 13		One Montgomery Street, 31st Street San Francisco, CA 94104
13		Telephone: 415/393-8200 Facsimile: 415/986-5309
15		Ronald C. Redcay
16		ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 777 South Figueroa Street
17		Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: 213/243-4000
18		Facsimile: 213/243-4199
19	6.7	Attorneys for Defendants Micron Technology, Inc. and Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc.
20	DATED: February	James G. Kreissman Harrison J. Frahn IV
21		Jason M. Bussey SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
22		1/
23		HARRISON J. FRAHN IV
24 25		2550 Hanover Street
26		Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: 650/251-5000
27		Facsimile: 650/251-5002
28		Attorneys for Defendants Elpida Memory (USA), Inc. and Elpida Memory, Inc.
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AL COMPLAINT [M-02-1486PJH]	LOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED

Case 4:02-md-01486-PJH Document 1359 Filed 02/20/07 Page 5 of 39

EXHIBIT 1

1	Guido Saveri (#22349)	
2	R. Alexander Saveri (#173102) Geoffrey C. Rushing (#126910)	
3	Cadio Zirpoli (#179108) SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.	
4	111 Pine Street, Suite 1700 San Francisco, CA 94111-5619	
5	Telephone: (415) 217-6810 guido@saveri.com	
6	rick@saveri.com	
7	Steve W. Berman (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Anthony D. Shapiro (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	
8	Craig R. Spiegel (122000) HAGENS BERMAN LLP	
9	1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101	
10	Telephone: (206) 623-7292 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594	
11	Fred Taylor Isquith (pro hac vice)	
12	Francis A. Bottini, Jr. WOLF, HALDENSTEIN, ADLER,	
13	FREEMAN & HERZ 270 Madison Avenue	
14	New York, NY 10016 Telephone: (212) 545-4600	
15	Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs	
16	[Additional Counsel on Signature Page]	
17	[radiional counsel on Signature 1 age]	
18	LINITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
19		RICT OF CALIFORNIA
20	NORTHERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
21	IN RE DRAM ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. M-02-1486PJH
22	IN REDRAM ANTITROST LITIGATION	
23		MDL No. 1486
24	This Document Relates to:	CORRECTED THIRD CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS
25	ALL ACTIONS	ACTION COMPLAINT
26		JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
27		
28		

[M-02-1486PJH] THIRD CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24 25

26

27 28

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. This action is brought as a class action on behalf of a plaintiff class (the "Class") consisting of all persons and entities who purchased in the United States Dynamic Random Access Memory chips or modules ("DRAM") directly from the named defendants during the period from approximately April 1, 1999 through at least June 30, 2002 (the "Class Period").
- 2. Defendants are the leading manufacturers of semiconductor memory products, including DRAM, and control the majority of the memory chip industry which annually generates worldwide revenues in excess of \$20 billion. Plaintiffs allege that during the Class Period, defendants conspired, combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which DRAM were sold in the United States. As a result of defendants' unlawful conduct, plaintiffs and the other members of the Class paid artificially inflated prices for DRAM during the Class Period. Such prices exceeded the amount they would have paid if the price for DRAM had been determined by a competitive market.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Plaintiffs bring this action under §§ 4, 12 and 16 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 15, 22 and 26) for treble damages and injunctive relief, as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs with respect to the injuries sustained by plaintiff arising from violations by defendants of the federal antitrust laws, including § 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. § 1).
- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1337(a) and 1367.
- 5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §§ 15 and 22, and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), in that at least one of the defendants resides in this judicial district, is licensed to do business or is doing business in this judicial district.

III. **PARTIES**

Plaintiffs

6. Plaintiff on Shore, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Chicago, Illinois. During the Class Period on Shore purchased DRAM from defendant Crucial

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Technology, Inc. ("Crucial"), a wholly owned subsidiary of defendant Micron Technology, Inc.

- 7. Plaintiff Internet Integration, Inc. is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Los Angeles. During the Class Period Internet Integration purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 8. Plaintiff Kevin Irwin d/b/a Kevin's Computer and Photo is a business entity with its principal place of business in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period Kevin Irwin d/b/a Kevin's Computer and Photo purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 9. Plaintiff PC Doctor, Inc. is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period PC Doctor, Inc. purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 10. Plaintiff Advanced Technology, Inc. is a corporation which during the class period purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 11. Plaintiff Network Business Solutions, Inc. is a Maryland corporation with its principal place of business in Baltimore, Maryland. During the Class Period Network Business Solutions, Inc. purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 12. Plaintiff JEM Electronics Distributors, Inc. is a Pennsylvania corporation. During the Class Period JEM Electronics Distributors, Inc. purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 13. Plaintiff C3 Information Technology, LLC is a Pennsylvania corporation with its principal place of business in Conshohocken, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period C3 Information Technology, LLC purchased DRAM from Crucial.
 - 14. Plaintiff Daniel Clement purchased DRAM during the Class Period from Crucial.
- 15. Plaintiff Web Ideals, LLC is a Pennsylvania Limited Liability Corporation with its principal place of business in Doylestown, Pennsylvania. During the Class Period Web Ideals, LLC purchased DRAM from Crucial.
- 16. Plaintiff 5207, Inc. is a corporation with its principal place of business in Skokie, Illinois. During the Class Period 5207, Inc. purchased DRAM from Crucial.

7

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Defendants

- 17. Defendant Micron Technology, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 8000 South Federal Way, Boise, Idaho 83707. During the time period covered in this complaint, Micron Technology, Inc. designed, developed, manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States. DRAM is Micron's primary semiconductor product.
- 18. Defendant Micron Semiconductor Products, Inc. is an Idaho corporation located at 8000 South Federal Way, Boise, Idaho and is a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of defendant Micron Technology, Inc. (collectively referred to as "Micron"). During the time period covered in this complaint, Micron sold DRAM through its Crucial Technology retail sales division to computer manufacturers and other end users throughout the United States.
- 19. Defendant Crucial Technology, Inc. ("Crucial") is a corporation with its principal place of business in Boise, Idaho. Crucial is a wholly owned subsidiary of Micron which operates the distribution business of Micron Technologies, Inc.
- 20. Defendant Infineon Technologies AG, a German corporation, maintains its headquarters at St. Martin-Str. 53, 81669, Munich, Germany. During the time period covered in this complaint, Infineon Technologies AG manufactured, sold, and distributed DRAM throughout the world, including the United States.
- 21. Defendant Infineon Technologies North America Corp. is a Delaware corporation which maintains offices at 1730 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95112. Infineon Technologies North America Corp. is a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of defendant Infineon Technologies AG (collectively referred to as "Infineon"). During the time period in this complaint, Infineon Technologies North America Corp. sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- Defendant Hynix Semiconductor, Inc. maintains its head offices at SAN 136-1, 22. Ami-Ri Bubal-eub, Ichon-si, Kyoungki-do, Korea. During the time covered in this complaint, Hynix Semiconductor, Inc. manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the world,

7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 including the United States.

- 23. Defendant Hynix Semiconductor America, Inc. is a California corporation located at 3101 North First Street, San Jose, California 95134. Hynix Semiconductor America, Inc. is a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of defendant Hynix Semiconductor, Inc. (collectively referred to as "Hynix"). During the time period covered by this complaint, Hynix Semiconductor America, Inc. sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 24. Defendant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., a Korean corporation, maintains its executive offices at Samsung Main Building, 250-2 ga, Taepyung-ro Chung-gu, Seoul, Korea. During the time period covered in this complaint, Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the world, including the United States.
- 25. Defendant Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. is a California corporation located at 3655 North First Street, San Jose, California 95134. Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. is a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of defendant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. (collectively referred to as "Samsung"). During the time period covered by this complaint, Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 26. Defendant Mosel Vitelic Inc. maintains its headquarters at No. 19 Li Hsin Road, Hsinchu Science Based Industrial Park, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C. During the time period covered by this complaint, Mosel Vitelic Inc. sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 27. Defendant Mosel Vitelic Corporation is a California corporation located at 3910 North First Street, San Jose, California 95134. Mosel Vitelic Corporation is a wholly owned and controlled subsidiary of defendant Mosel Vitelic Inc.. During the time period covered by this complaint, Mosel Vitelic Corporation sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 28. Defendant Nanya Technology Corporation is a Taiwanese corporation which maintains its headquarters at HWA YA Technology Park, 669, Fu Hsing 3rd Rd. Keuishan, Taoyuan, Taiwan, R.O.C. During the time period covered by this complaint, Nanya Technology Corporation sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.

7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

- 29. Defendant Nanya Technology Corporation USA is located at 675 E. Brokaw Road, San Jose, California 95112. Nanya Technology Corporation USA is a branch office of defendant Nanya Technology Corporation. In addition to the sales and marketing office in San Jose, Nanya Technology Corporation operates memory design centers in San Jose and Houston, Texas. During the time period covered by this complaint, Nanya Technology Corporation USA sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 30. Defendant Winbond Electronics Corporation ("Winbond"), is headquartered at 4, Creaton Road, 111, Science-Based Industrial park, Hsinchu, Taiwan, R.O.C. During the time period covered in this complaint, Winbond manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 31. Defendant Winbond Electronics Corporation America, located at 2727 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Winbond which sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States during the time period covered in this complaint.
- 32. Defendant Elpida Memory, Inc. ("Elpida") maintains its executive offices at Sumitomo Seimei Yaesu Bldg., 3F, 2-1 Yaseu 2-chome, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan. During the time period covered in this complaint, Elpida manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 33. Defendant Elpida Memory (USA) Inc., located at 2001 Walsh Avenue, Santa Clara, CA 95050, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Elpida which sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States during the time period covered in this complaint.
- 34. Defendant NEC Electronics America, Inc. ("NEC") maintains its corporate headquarters at 2880 Scott Boulevard, Santa Clara, California 95050-2554 and its manufacturing plant in Roseville, California. It is a wholly owned subsidiary of NEC Electronics Corporation. During the time period covered in this complaint, NEC manufactured, sold and distributed DRAM throughout the United States.
- 35. Various other individuals, partnerships, corporations, and other business entities. unknown to the plaintiffs, have participated in the violations alleged herein and have performed

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

2.7

28

acts and made statements in furtherance thereof.

The acts charged in this Complaint have been done by defendants or were ordered 36. or done by defendants' officers, agents, employees, or representatives, while actively engaged in the management of defendants' affairs.

IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

37. Plaintiffs bring this action both on behalf of themselves, and as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(a) and (b)(3), on behalf of the following class (the "Class").

> All individuals and entities who, during the period from approximately April 1, 1999 through at least June 30, 2002 (the "Class Period"), purchased DRAM in the United States directly from the defendants or their subsidiaries. Excluded from the class are defendants and their parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, all governmental entities, and coconspirators.

- 38. Plaintiffs do not know the exact number of class members because such information is in the exclusive control of defendants. Plaintiffs believe that, due to the nature of the trade and commerce involved, there are most likely hundreds of thousands of class members, geographically dispersed throughout the United States such that joinder of all class members is impracticable.
- 39. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class in that plaintiffs are direct purchasers of DRAM, all class members were damaged by the same wrongful conduct of defendants and their co-conspirators as alleged herein, and the relief sought is common to the class.
- 40. Numerous questions of law or fact arise from defendants' anticompetitive conduct that is common to the class. Among the questions of law or fact common to the class are:
- whether defendants engaged in a contract, combination or conspiracy among a. themselves to fix, maintain or stabilize the prices of, or allocate the market for, DRAM sold in the United States;

24

25

26

27

28

- whether the conduct of defendants caused prices of DRAM to be artificially b. inflated to non-competitive levels; and
- c. whether plaintiff and other members of the class were injured by the conduct of defendants and, if so, the appropriate class-wide measure of damages and appropriate injunctive relief.
- 41. These common questions of law or fact are common to the class, and predominate over any other questions affecting only individual class members.
- 42. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class in that plaintiffs are typical direct purchasers of DRAM and have no conflicts with any other member of the class. Furthermore, plaintiffs have retained competent counsel experienced in antitrust and class action litigation.
- 43. A class action is superior to the alternatives, if any, for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.
- 44. Prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications, establishing incompatible standards of conduct for the defendants.
- 45 Injunctive relief is appropriate as to the class as a whole because defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class.
- 46. Plaintiffs reserve the right to expand, modify or alter the class definition in response to information learned during discovery.

V. TRADE AND COMMERCE

- 47. During the Class Period, defendants sold and shipped substantial quantities of DRAM in a continuous and uninterrupted flow of interstate and international commerce to customers located in states other than the states in which defendants are located.
- 48. The business activities of defendants that are the subject of this Complaint were within the flow of, and substantially affected, interstate trade and commerce.
 - 49. During the Class Period, defendants, amongst whom are the four largest DRAM

producers in the world, have most of the DRAM sales in the global market.

2

3

A.

The DRAM Industry

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

STATEMENT OF FACTS

VI.

50. DRAM are high density, low-cost-per bit, random access memory components that store digital information and provide high-speed storage and retrieval of data used in personal computers, printers, digital cameras, wireless telephones, and other electronic devices as a storage module to hold data as it is processed. DRAM is the most common kind of random access memory chip sold both in new computers and computer upgrades in the United States. DRAM is sold in individual chips or modules with several chips attached to the module.

51. DRAM revenue exceeds \$20 billion a year. The world's top four makers of DRAM, defendants herein, control roughly 70% of the market; the top six manufacturers, defendants herein, control 96% of the market. As of 2000, Samsung was the top DRAM manufacturer with 23% of the market share, followed by Micron with 21%, Hynix with 19% and Toshiba with 7%. At the end of 2001, Micron acquired Toshiba's DRAM production, further consolidated the industry and the dominant market position exercised by defendants. Thereafter, Infineon became the fourth largest DRAM maker.

В. DRAM Prices Fall Steadily Prior to the Class Period

- At certain times beginning at least as early as 1999, the prices of DRAM declined 52. dramatically.
- 53. On information and belief, as a result of these price declines, each of the defendants had experienced material decreases in selling prices, and, at times, were selling DRAM at or below manufacturing costs. All of the defendants were facing an uncertain future if prices continued to decline with potential bankruptcy as a possibility for some, and a continuing erosion of profits for others.

Price Fixing and the Rise in DRAM Prices During the Class Period

54. In view of the economic conditions of the industry, the defendants entered into agreements designed to combat the price decline in the industry. These agreements had the effect

9

11 12

10

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

both of artificially limiting the rate of DRAM price declines, and, at other times, of artificially increasing the DRAM price.

- 55. For example, sometime in the Spring or early summer of 1999, and again sometime in the fall of 2001, realizing the economic trends of the industry, defendants agreed to reduce supply in order to artificially raise prices. As part of their agreement, each defendant agreed to cut production so that, as supplies were restrained by their agreement, prices for DRAM would increase. Thus, throughout the Class Period, Defendants entered into agreements or understandings regarding the sale and marketing of DRAM, the purpose of which was to raise, fix and stabilize the prices for DRAM.
- 56. A news article on the DRAM industry reported that defendant Mosel Vitelic and other DRAM producers had met to discuss measures that could be taken to halt "the downward spiral of DRAM prices." Defendant Mosel Vitelic's Vice President Chang indicated in September 2001 that "a basis for understanding had been reached" between chip makers to "trim some production starting September." Chang stated that all DRAM makers would have to agree for the plan to have the desired effect of raising prices.
- 57. On or about November 2001, prices for DRAM rose dramatically, and by February 2002, prices had risen as high as \$4.50.
- 58. It has been reported in the press that an officer of DRAM manufacturer Mosel Vitelic admitted that price fixing meetings occurred, and that an agreement had been reached between the major DRAM producers to push prices up by reducing supply. According to press reports, Hynix and Samsung executives visited both Mosel Vitelic and Nanya Technology executives to discuss these agreements.
- 59. The ability of DRAM makers to fix the price of their product was confirmed by defendant Mosel Vitelic Vice President Thomas Chang's statements reported in the Detroit News and the Taipei Times on May 16 and May 17, 2002, respectively. According to the reports, Mosel Vitelic Inc., Taiwan's third-largest memory-chip maker, said it agreed with rivals to restrict spot market sales, aiming to boost chip prices." The reports indicated that DRAM makers were

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

attempting to "encourage a price of \$3" for DRAM chips. Chang stated "You don't need to have a meeting, you just need to have a phone call." The reports indicated that there was no formal meeting of DRAM makers because according to Chang, "Everybody knows each other. We just said try not to sell below \$3."

VII. VIOLATIONS ALLEGED

- 60. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference as if fully set forth, the preceding allegations of this Complaint.
- 61. Beginning in or about April 1, 1999, the exact date being unknown to plaintiffs, defendants, by and through their officers, directors, employees, agents, or other representatives, entered in a continuing contract, combination or conspiracy to unreasonably restrain trade and commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.
- 62. Defendants, by their unlawful conspiracy, artificially raised, inflated and maintained the market price of DRAM as herein alleged.
- 63. The contract, combination or conspiracy consisted of a continuing agreement, understanding and concert of action among defendants and their co-conspirators, the substantial terms of which were to fix, raise, maintain and stabilize the prices of, and/or allocate the market for, DRAM they sold in the United States.
- 64. Upon information and belief, for the purpose of formulating and effectuating their contract, combination or conspiracy, defendants and their co-conspirators did those things they contracted, combined or conspired to do, including:
- participating in meetings and conversations to discuss the prices of and/or a. allocate the market for DRAM;
- b. agreeing to manipulate prices and supply so as to boost sagging DRAM sales in a manner that deprived direct purchasers of free and open competition;
- issuing price announcements and price quotations in accordance with the c. agreements reached; and
 - d. selling DRAM to customers in the United States at non-competitive prices.

11

10

13

12

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

25 26

24

27

28

65. As a direct result of the unlawful conduct of defendants and their co-conspirators in furtherance of their continuing contract, combination or conspiracy, plaintiffs and other members of the class have been injured in their business and property in that they have paid more for DRAM than they would have paid in the absence of defendants' price fixing.

- 66. On June 18, 2002, defendant Micron announced it had been cooperating with the Department of Justice's antitrust investigation of the DRAM industry.
- 67. By June 20, 2002, defendants Samsung, Hynix and Infineon confirmed that they had received subpoenas from a grand jury which has been publicly reported as having been led in this District.
- 68. On September 12, 2003, defendants Elpida Memory and NEC Electronics America announced that they had received subpoenas from the grand jury investigating manipulation of the market for DRAM.
- 69. In addition, analysts have indicated that the Department of Justice may be investigating DRAM producers, including defendants, to determine whether memory producers combined to lower prices in order to drive smaller, weaker rivals out of the market. The result of this illegal anticompetitive activity is to limit the number of DRAM producers and stifle future competition and result in irreversible price increases.
- 70. Published reports indicate that the Department of Justice's investigation is broad in scope and includes numerous DRAM makers including all of the defendants herein.
- 71. On or about September 14, 2004, defendant Infineon Technologies AG entered into a plea agreement with the government pursuant to which it agreed to plead guilty to conspiring to fix prices in the DRAM market from July 1, 1999 through June 15, 2002.
- On or about April 20, 2005, defendant Hynix Semiconductor Inc. entered into a 72. plea agreement with the government pursuant to which it agreed to plead guilty to conspiring to fix prices in the DRAM market from April 1, 1999 through June 15, 2002.

VIII. EFFECTS

73. The above combination and conspiracy has had the following effects, among others:

a. price competition in the sale of DRAM by defendants and their coconspirators has been restrained, suppressed and eliminated throughout the United States;

- b. prices for DRAM sold by defendants have been raised, fixed, maintained and stabilized at artificially high and noncompetitive levels throughout the United States; and
- c. direct purchasers of DRAM from defendants have been deprived of the benefit of free and open competition in the purchase of DRAM.
- 74. As a direct and proximate result of the unlawful conduct of defendants, plaintiffs and other members of the class have been injured in their business and property in that they paid more for DRAM than they otherwise would have paid in the absence of the unlawful conduct of defendants.

IX. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

- 75. Plaintiffs had no knowledge of the combination and conspiracy alleged herein, or of any facts that might have led to the discovery thereof in the exercise of reasonable diligence, prior to June, 2002 when defendants Micron, Samsung, Hynix and Infineon announced that the Department of Justice was investigating the DRAM industry.
- 76. Plaintiffs could not have discovered the existence of the combination and conspiracy alleged herein at an earlier date by the exercise of reasonable due diligence because of the deceptive practices and techniques of secrecy employed by the defendants and their coconspirators to avoid detection and affirmatively conceal such violations including, without limitation, falsely attributing price increases to increased demand, shortages in supply, increased manufacturing costs, increased prices of labor and of raw materials, and/or insufficient production capacity. Defendants and their co-conspirators also falsely informed their customers that they were unable to sell their products at a lower price due to increased manufacturing costs, increased prices of labor and of raw materials, and insufficient production capacity.
 - 77. These false statements included, without limitation:
- a. in an article in Electronic News on September 13, 1999, defendants attributed DRAM price increases to increased demand due to strong sales of low PCs incorporating

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

large quantities of DRAM. Avo Kanadjian, vice president of marketing of defendant Samsung Semiconductor, Inc. said: "Because we see the value PC and free PCs entering the market at extraordinary numbers, DRAM oversupply has silently gone into a shortage." Chee-Wai Ho, director of product marketing for memory products at defendant Infineon Technologies AG agreed.

b. in an interview on December 4, 2001, published on Simmtester.com, Steve Appleton, chief executive officer of defendant Micron Technology, Inc., was asked why prices had recently increased sharply and suddenly. He answered:

> I have no idea. There clearly was a belated increase in demand as the seasonal rebound we had expected two-and-a-half months earlier finally kicked in. And, clearly the Japanese are cutting back their DRAM production. Even Hynix, which is so unpredictable, cut some production by temporarily closing its Eugene, Ore., fab. When it was running at 40K wafer capacity a month, that fab alone probably had about 2.5% of the world's DRAM production.

- in a press release issued on April 15, 2002, Hynix cited increased demand in the DRAM market as the reason for an increase in revenue.
- 78. Plaintiffs had no reason to disbelieve these statements which on their face appeared to be reasonable explanations for the pricing of DRAM. Furthermore, most of the explanations provided by defendants involved non-public and/or proprietary information completely in defendants' control such that plaintiffs and members of the class could not verify their accuracy. Defendants' purported reasons for the price increases of DRAM were materially false and misleading and were made for the purpose of concealing defendants' anti-competitive scheme as alleged herein. In truth, at all relevant times, the price of DRAM was artificially inflated and maintained as a direct result of the defendants' anti-competitive scheme, the operation of which was a substantial (but undisclosed) factor in the pricing of DRAM during the class period.
- 79. As a result of the fraudulent concealment of the conspiracy, Plaintiffs assert the tolling of the applicable statute of limitations affecting the causes of action by Plaintiffs and the

member of the class.

5

. ...

X. DAMAGES

DRAM directly from defendants, or their subsidiaries, agents, and/or affiliates, and, by reason of the antitrust violations herein alleged, paid more for such products than they would have paid in the absence of such antitrust violations. As a result, plaintiffs and the other members of the class have sustained damages to their business and property in an amount to be determined at trial.

XI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment against defendants as follows:

- A. A declaration that this action is a proper class action under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(b)(3) on behalf of the class as defined herein, and an Order directing that reasonable notice of this action, as provided by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 23(c)(2), be given to each member of the class;
- B. A declaration that the unlawful combination and conspiracy alleged herein is an unreasonable restraint of trade of commerce in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1;
- C. An injunction enjoining, preliminarily and permanently, defendants from continuing the unlawful combination and conspiracy alleged herein;
- D. An award to plaintiffs and each member of the class damages, as provided by law, and joint and several judgments in favor of plaintiffs and each member of the class against defendants, and each of them, in an amount to be trebled in accordance with the antitrust laws:
- E. An award to plaintiffs and the class for the costs of this suit (including expert fees), and reasonable attorneys' fees, as provided by law; and
- F. An award for such other and further relief as the nature of this case may require or as this court deems just, equitable and proper.

JURY DEMAND 1 2 Plaintiffs demand a jury trial, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 38(b), of 3 all triable issues. DATED: February , 2007 4 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC. 5 6 7 Geoffrey C. Rushing Cadio Zirpoli 8 111 Pine Street, Suite 1700 San Francisco, CA 94111-5619 9 Phone: (415) 217-6810 Fax: (415) 217-6813 10 11 HAGENS BERMAN LLP 12 13 14 Anthony D. Shapiro 15 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 16 Phone: (206) 623-7292 Fax: (206) 623-0594 17 WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER 18 FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 19 20 21 750 B Street, Suite 2770 San Diego, CA 92101 22 Phone: (619) 239-4599 Fax: (619) 234-4599 23 - and -24 Fred Taylor Isquith 25 270 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016 26 Phone: (212) 545-4600 27 Fax: (212) 545-4653 28 Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel

1	
2 3 4 5	Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr. Susan G. Kupfer BERMAN DEVALERIO PEASE TABACCO BURT & PUCILLO 425 California Street, Suite 2025 San Francisco, CA 94104 Phone: (415) 433-3200 Fax: (415) 433-6382
6	Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel
7	
8	Christopher Lovell Christopher J. Gray LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN, LLP 500 Fifth Avenue
10	New York, NY 10100 Phone: (212) 608-1900 Fax: (212) 719-4677
12	-and-
13	Merrick Scott Rayle
14	LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN, LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 1138
15	San Francisco, ČA 94111 Phone: (415) 874-3636
16	Fax: (415) 874-3124
17	Bruce Simon Steven N. Williams
18	Peter E. Borkon COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY
19	San Francisco Airport Office Center 840 Malcom Road, Suite 200
20	Burlingame, CA 94010 Phone: (650) 697-6997
21	Fax: (650) 697-0577
22	Steve Kanner Douglas A. Millen
23	MUCH, SHELIST, FREED, DENENBERG, AMENT & RUBENSTEIN, PC
24	200 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2100 Chicago, IL 60601
25	Phone: (312) 521-2000 Fax: (312) 521-2100
26	1 ax. (312) 321-2100
27	
8	

Leonard B. Simon 1 Bonny E. Sweeney 2 Christopher M. Burke Susan G. Taylor 3 MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD HYNES & LERACH LLP 4 401 "B" Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101 5 Phone: (619) 231-1058 Fax: (619) 231-7423 6 7 Eugene A. Spector Jeffrey J. Corrigan 8 John A. Macoretta SPECTOR, ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C. 9 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103 10 Phone: (215) 496-0300 Fax: (215) 496-6611 11 Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr. 12 Susan G. Kupfer BERMAN DEVALERIO PEASE 13 TABACCO BURT & PUCILLO 425 California Street, Suite 2025 14 San Francisco, CA 94104 Phone: (415) 433-3200 15 Fax: (415) 433-6382 16 Plaintiffs' Executive Committee Counsel 17 Additional Plaintiffs' Counsel 18 Ann D. White 19 Jayne A. Goldstein Michael J. Kane 20 MAGER WHITE & GOLDSTEIN, LLP 165 Township Line Road, Suite 2400 21 Jenkintown, PA 19046 Phone: (215) 481-0273 22 Fax: (215) 481-0271 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 2 3 4	David R. Scott James E. Miller SCOTT & MILLER, LLC 108 Norwich Avenue Colchester, CT 06415 Phone: (860) 537-5537 Fax: (860) 537-4432
5 6	Charles J. Piven LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES J. PIVEN The World Trade Center – Baltimore 401 E. Pratt Street
7 8	Baltimore, MD 21202 Phone: (410) 332-0030 Fax: (410) 685-1300
9 10	Philip H. Gordon GORDON LAW OFFICES
11	623 West Hays St. Boise, ID 83702 Phone: (208) 345-7100
12	Fax: (208) 345-0050
13	Andrew B. Sacks
14	SACKS WESTON SMOLINSKY ALBERT & LUBER
15 16	510 Walnut Street, Suite 400 Philadelphia, PA 19106 Phone: (215) 925-8200 Fax: (215) 925-0508
17	
18	J. Mitchell Clark LAW OFFICES OF J. MITCHELL CLARK Frost Bank Plaza, 21st Floor
19	802 North Carancahau Corpus Christi, TX 78470
20	Phone: (361) 887-8500 Fax: (361) 882-4500
21	William R. Edwards, III
22	THE EDWARDS LAW FIRM LLP 1400 Frost Bank Plaza
23	802 North Carancahua Corpus Christi, TX 78403
25	Phone: (361) 698-7600 Fax: (361) 698-7614
26	
27	
28	

1	Mark S. Goldman WEINSTEIN, KITCHENOFF, SCARLOTO
2	AND GOLDMAN, LTD. 1845 Walnut Street, Suite 1100
3	Philadelphia, PA 19103 Phone: (215) 545-7200
4	Fax: (215) 545-6535
5	James A. Bashian LAW OFFICES OF JAMES A. BASHIAN
6	500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2700 New York, NY 10110
7	Phone: (212) 921-4110
8	Fax: (212) 921-4249
9	William M. Audet Ryan M. Hagan ALEXANDER, HAWES & AUDET
11	300 Montgomery Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94104 Phone: (415) 982-1776
12	Fax: (415) 576-1776
13	Roy L. Jacobs 292 Madison Avenue, 15th Floor
14	New York, NY 10017 Phone: (212) 759-4600
15	Fax: (212) 486-2093
16	Michael D. Hausfeld
17	COHEN MILSTEIN HAUSFELD & TOLL
18	1100 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 500, West Tower
19	Washington, DC 20005-3934 Phone: (202) 408-4600
20	Fax: (202) 408-4699
21	Linda P. Nussbaum COHEN MILSTEIN HAUSFELD
22	& TOLL PLLC 825 Third Avenue, 30th Floor
23	New York, NY 10022 Phone: (212) 838-7797
24	Fax: (212) 838-7745
25	Michael E. Criden HANZMAN & CRIDEN, P.A.
26	220 Alhambra Circle, Suite 400 Coral Gables, FL 33134
27	Phone: (305) 357-9000 Fax: (305) 357-9050
28	1 an. (505) 551 5050

Robert C. Gilbert ROBERT C. GILBERT, P.A.
Commercebank Center, Suite 400
220 Alhambra Circle Coral Gables, FL 33134
Phone: (305) 529-9100 Fax: (305) 529-1612
Robert C. Schubert
Juden Justice Reed William F. Jonckher
SCHUBERT & REED, LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1660
San Francisco, CA 94111 Phone: (415) 788-4220
Fax: (415) 788-0161
Marvin A. Miller MILLER FAUCHER & CAFFERTY LLP
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 3200 Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: (312) 782-4880 Fax: (312) 782-4485
Bernard Persky
GOODKIND LABATON, RUDOFF &
SUCHAROW, LLP 100 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017-5563 Phone: (212) 907-0700
Fax: (212) 818-0477
Mark Reinhardt Mark A. Wendorf
Garrett D. Blanchfield, Jr. REINHARDT WENDORF &
BLANCHFIELD
E-1250 First National Bank Building 322 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101 Phone: (651) 287-2100
Fax: $(6\hat{5}1) 2\hat{8}7-2103$
Martin D. Chitwood CHITWOOD & HARLEY
2900 Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309
Phone: (404) 873-3900 Fax: (404) 876-4476

1 2 3 4	Brian P. Murray RABIN & PECKEL LLP 275 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016 Phone: (212) 682-1818 Fax: (212) 682-1892
5	Karl L. Cambronne
6	CHESTNUT & CAMBRONNE 3700 Piper Jaffrey Tower
7	222 South Ninth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 Phone: (612) 339-7300 Fax: (612) 336-2940
8	
9	Laurence D. King Lori E. Sambol KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
11	601 Montgomery Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111
12	Phone: (415) 772-4700 Fax: (415) 772-4707
13	
14	Robert N. Kaplan Gregory K. Arenson
15	KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP 805 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor
16	New York, NY 10022 Phone: (212) 687-1980
17	Fax: (212) 687-7714
18	Mr. Gary Specks KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
19	203 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2100 Chicago, IL 60601
20	Phone: (312) 558-1584 Fax: (312) 558-1585
21	Lawrence Walner
22	LAWRENCE WALNER & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
23	150 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1870 Chicago, IL 60606
24	Phone: (312) 201-1616 Fax: (312) 201-1538
25	John Peter Zavez
26	ADKINS, KELSTON & ZAVEZ, P.C. 90 Canal Street, Suite 500
27	Boston, MA 02114 Phone: (617) 367-1040
28	Fax: (617) 742-8280

	1
1 2 3 4	Joseph C. Kohn William E. Hoese KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C. One S. Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, PA 19107 Phone: (215) 238-1700 Fax: (215) 238-1968
5	Gregory P. Hansel
6	PRETI, FLAHERTY, BELIVEAU PACHIOS & HALEY, LLC
7	One City Center P.O. Box 9546
8	Portland, ME 04112 Phone: (207) 791-3000
9	Fax: (207) 791-3111
10	Steven D. Irwin
11	Patrick Sorek LEECH, TISHMAN, FUSCALDO
12	& LAMPL, LLC 1800 Frick Building
13	Pittsburg, PA 15219 Phone: (412) 261-1600
14	Fax: (412) 227-5551
15	Diane M. Nast
16	Michael G. Nast RODA & NAST P.C.
17	801 Estelle Drive Lancaster, PA 17601
18	Phone: (717) 892-3000 Fax: (717) 892-1200
19	Roger M. Schrimp
20	Clinton P. Walker Gene J. Stonebarger
21	DAMRELL, NEĽSON, SCHRIMP, PALLIOS PACHER & SILVA
22	PALLIOS PACHER & SILVA 1601 "T" Street, 5 th Floor Modesto, CA 95354
23	Phone: (209) 526-3500 Fax: (209) 526-3534
24	
25	Jeremiah F. Hallisey HALLISEY & JOHNSON
26	300 Montgomery Street, Suite 538 San Francisco, CA 94104-1901
27	Phone: (415) 433-5300 Fax: (415) 433-5342
8	
- 11	

1		Randy Renick LAW OFFICES OF RANDY RENICK
2		The Marine Building 128 N. Fair Oaks Ave., Suite 204
3		Pasadena, CA 91023 Phone: (626) 585-9608
4		Fax: (626) 577-7079
5		Leonard Barrack Jeffrey B. Gittleman
6		BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE 3300 Two Commerce Square
7		2001 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103
8		Phone: (215) 963-0600 Fax: (215) 963-0838
10		· ,
11		Krishna B. Narine SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY LLP
12		Three Bala Plaza East, Suite 400 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
13		Phone: (610) 667-7706 Fax: (610) 667-7056
14		Isacc Diel
15		DIEL & SEELAM, p.c. 4121 W. 83 rd Street, Suite 254
16		Prairie Village, KS 66208 Phone: (913) 383-8711
17		Fax: (913) 383-8712
18		Joel C. Meredith Steven J. Greenfogel
19		MEREDITH COHEN GREENFOGEL & SKIRNICK, PC
20		117 S. 17 th Street, 22 nd Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103
21		Phone: (215) 564-5182 Fax: (215) 569-0958
22		Richard A. Lockridge
23		LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P. 100 Washington Ave S.
24		Minneapolis, MN 55401-2179 Phone: (612) 339-6900
25	Ram.215	Fax: (612) 339-0981
26		
27		
28	14511	
- 1	I	

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Maureen Longdo, the undersigned, declare:

- 1. That declarant is and was, at all times herein mentioned, a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of San Diego, over the age of 18 years, and not a party to or interested in the within action; that declarant's business address is 750 B Street, Suite 2770, San Diego, California 92101.
- 2. That on February 9, 2007, declarant served STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ALLOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT via the CM/ECF System to the parties who are registered participants of the CM/ECF System.
 - 3. That there is regular communication between the parties.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 9th day of February 2007, at San Diego, California.

MAUREEN LONGOO

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER ALLOWING THE FILING OF CORRECTED THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT -- [M-02-1486PJH]

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Francis M. Gregorek
Betsy C. Manifold
Francis A. Bottini
Rachele R. Rickert
WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP
750 B Street, Suite 2770
San Diego, CA 92101
619/239-4599
619/234-4599 (fax)

Fred T. Isquith
Thomas H. Burt
WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER
FREEMAN & HERZ LLP
270 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016
212/545-4600
212/545-4653 (fax)

Mary Jane Fait WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 55 West Monroe, Suite 1111 Chicago, IL 60603 312/984-0000 312/984-0001 (fax)

Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr.
BERMAN DeVALERIO PEASE
TABACCO BURT & PUCILLO
425 California Street, Suite 2100
San Francisco, CA 94104
415/433-3200
415/433-6382 (fax)

Guido Saveri R. Alexander Saveri Geoffrey C. Rushing Cadio Zirpoli SAVERI & SAVERI, INC. 111 Pine Street, Suite 1700 San Francisco, CA 94111 415/217-6810 415/217-6813 (fax) Steve W. Berman Anthony D. Shapiro Craig R. Spiegel HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98101 206/623-7292 206/623-0594 (fax)

Bruce L. Simon
Steven N. Williams
Peter E. Borkon
COTCHETT, PITRE, SIMON & McCARTHY
San Francisco Airport Office Center
840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
Burlingame, CA 94010
650/697-6000
650/697-0577 (fax)

Merrick Scott Rayle LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN, LP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 1138 San Francisco, CA 94111 415/874-3636 415/874-3124 (fax)

Leonard B. Simon
Bonny E. Sweeney
Christopher Burke
Susan G. Taylor
LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA
GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

Christopher Lovell Christopher J. Gray LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN, LLP 500 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10110 212/608-9100 212/719-4677 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Steven Kanner
Douglas A. Millen
MUCH, SHELIST, FREED, DENENBERG,
AMENT & RUBENSTEIN PC
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 1800
Chicago, IL 60606-1615
312/521-2000
312/521-2100 (fax)

Eugene A. Spector Jeffrey J. Corrigan John A. Macoretta SPECTOR, ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C. 1818 Market Street, Suite 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103 215/496-0300 215/496-6611 (fax)

Ann D. White Jayne A. Goldstein Michael J. Kane MAGER WHITE & GOLDSTEIN LLP 165 Township Line Road, Suite 2400 Jenkintown, PA 19046 215/481-0273 215/481-0271 (fax)

Laurence D. King Lori E. Sambol KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94111 415/772-4700 415/772-4704 (fax)

Gary L. Specks KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER 203 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2100 Chicago, IL 60601 312/558-1584 312/558-1585 (fax) Robert Kaplan KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER 805 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor New York, NY 10022 212/687-1980 212/687-7714 (fax)

Lawrence Walner LAWRENCE WALNER & ASSOCIATES, LTD. 150 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2150 Chicago, IL 60606 312/201-1616 312/201-1538 (fax)

David R. Scott James E. Miller SCOTT & SCOTT LLC 108 Norwich Colchester, CT 06415 860/537-5537

Michael D. Hausfeld COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD & TOLL, P.L.L.C. 1100 New York Avenue, N.W. West Tower, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20005 202/408-4600 202/408-4699 (fax)

Linda P. Nussbaum COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD & TOLL, P.L.L.C. 825 Third Avenue, 30th Floor New York, NY 10022 212/838-7797 212/838-7745 (fax)

Michael E. Criden HANZMAN & CRIDEN, P.A. Commercebank Center, Suite 400 220 Alhambra Circle Coral Gables, FL 33134 305/357-9000 305/357-9050 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF (S)

Robert C. Gilbert ROBERT C. GILBERT, P.A. Commercebank Center, Suite 400 220 Alhambra Circle Coral Gables, FL 33134 305/529-9100 305/529-1612 (fax)

Joseph C. Kohn William E. Hoese KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C. One South Broad Street, Suite 2100 Philadelphia, PA 19107 215/238-1700 215/238-1968 (fax)

Gregory P. Hansel
PRETI, FLAHERTY, BELIVEAU,
PACHIOS & HALEY, LLC
One City Center
P. O. Box 9546
Portland, ME 04112
207/791-3000
207/791-3111 (fax)

Steven D. Irwin
Patrick Sorek
LEECH, TISHMAN, FUSCALDO & LAMPL, LLC
525 William Penn P1 #30
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1707
412/261-1600
412/227-5551 (fax)

Karl Cambronne CHESTNUT & CAMBRONNE 3700 Piper Jaffray Tower 222 South Ninth Street Minneapolis, MN 55042 612/339-7300 612/336-2940 (fax) Mark Reinhardt
Mark A. Wendorf
Garret D. Blanchfield, Jr.
REINHARDT & ANDERSON
332 Minnesota Street, E1000
Fifth National Bank Building
St. Paul, MN 55101
651/227-9990
651/297-6543 (fax)

Isaac Diel DIEL & SEELAMN, PC 4121 W. 83rd Street, Suite 254 Prairie Village, KS 66208

Philip Gordon GORDON LAW OFFICES CHARTERED 1602 W. Franklin Street Boise, ID 83702

Brian Murray RABIN & PECKEL 275 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10016 212/682-1818 212/682-1892 (fax)

Martin Chitwood Craig Harley Nicole Davenport CHITWOOD & HARLEY 2900 Promenade II 1230 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309 404/873-3900 404/876-4476 (fax)

John Peter Zavez, P.C. ADKINS, KELSTON & ZAVEZ, P.C. 90 Canal Street, Suite 500 Boston, MA 02114 617/367-1040 617/742-8280 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Andrew Sacks SACKS, WESTON, SMOLINSKY, ALBERT & LUBER 510 Walnut Street, Suite 400 Philadelphia, PA 19106 215/925-8200 215/925-0508 (fax)

Charles J. Piven LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES PIVEN, P.A. The World Trade Center - Baltimore 401 East Pratt Street Baltimore, MD 21202 410/332-0030 410/685-1300 (fax)

Dianne M. Nast Michael G. Nast RODA & NAST, P.C. 801 Estelle Drive Lancaster, PA 17601 717/892-3000 717/892-1200 (Fax)

Roger M. Schrimp Clinton P. Walker Gene J. Stonebarger DAMRELL, NELSON, SCHRIMP, PALLIOS, PACHER & SILVA 1601 I Street, Fifth Floor Modesto, CA 95354 209/526-3500 209/526-3534 (fax)

Jeremiah F. Hallisey HALLISEY & JOHNSON 300 Montgomery Street, Suite 538 San Francisco, CA 94104-1901 415/433-5300 415/433-5342 (fax)

James V. Bashian LAW OFFICES OF JAMES V. BASHIAN P.C. 500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2700 New York, NY 10110 Randy Renick LAW OFFICES OF RANDY RENICK The Marine Building 128 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 204 Pasadena, CA 91102 626/585-9508

Leonard Barrack
Jeffrey B. Gittleman
BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE
3300 Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/963-0600
215/963-0838 (fax)

Richard A. Lockridge LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P. 100 Washington Avenue S. Minneapolis, MN 55401-2179 612/339-6900 612/339-0981 (fax)

Krishna B. Narine SCHIFFRIN & BARROWAY, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087 610/667-7706 610/667-7056 (fax)

Joel C. Meredith Steven J. Greenfogel MEREDITH COHEN GREENFOGEL & SKIRNICK, PC 117 South 17th Street, 22nd Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103

Roy L. Jacobs LAW OFFICES OF ROY L. JACOBS 292 Madison Avenue 15th Floor New York, NY 10017

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Marvin A. Miller MILLER FAUCHER AND CAFFERTY LLP 30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 3200 Chicago, IL 60602 312/782-4880 312/782-4485

Robert C. Schubert
Juden Justice Reed
William F. Jonckner
SCHUBERT & REED LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Suite 1660
San Francisco, CA 94111
415/788-4220
415/788-0160 (fax)

Bernard Persky LABATON SUCHAROW & RUDOFF LLP 100 Park Avenue New York, NY 10017 212/907-0700 212/818-0477 (fax)

William M. Audet ALEXANDER, HAWES & AUDET LLP 152 North 3rd Street, Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95112 408/289-1776 408/287-1775 (fax)

J. Mitchell Clark LAW OFFICES OF J. MITCHELL CLARK Frost Bank Plaza, 21st Floor 802 North Carancahua Corpus Christi, TX 78470

William Edwards THE EDWARDS LAW FIRM, LLP 1440 Frost Bank Plaza 802 North Carancahua Corpus Christi, TX 78470

Stewart M. Weltman STEWART M. WELTMAN, P.C. 39 South La Salle Street, Suite 308 Chicago, IL 60603 Mark Goldman WEINSTEIN, KITCHENOFF, SCARLATO & GOLDMAN, LTD. 1845 Walnut Street, Suite 1100 Philadelphia, PA 19103 212/545-7200 212/545-6535 (fax)

Francis O. Scarpulla ZELLE HOFMANN VOELBEL MASON & GETTE, LLP 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400 San Francisco, CA 94104 415/693-0700 415/693-0770 (fax)

David Boies Timothy D. Battin Ian Otto STRAUS & BOIES LLP 4041 University Drive, Fifth Floor Fairfax, VA 22030 703/764-8700 703/764-8704 (fax)

Kenneth Walsh STRAUS & BOIES LLP Two Depot Plaza, Suite 203 Bedford Hills, NY 10507 914/244-3200 914/244-3260 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Jonathan M. Jacobson AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD 590 Madison Avenue New York, NY 10022 212/872-1000 212/872-1002 (fax)

Jeffrey S. Davidson Eileen Barish KIRKLAND & ELLIS 777 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 213/680-8400 213/680-8500 (fax)

Case 4:02-md-01486-PJH Document 1359 Filed 02/20/07 Page 38 of 39

DYNAMIC RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY (DRAM) Service List -- October 7, 2003 Page 6

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Tefft W. Smith KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 655 Fifteenth St., N.W. Washington, DC 20005 202/879-5000 202/879-5200 (fax)

Ronald C. Redcay ARNOLD & PORTER LLP 777 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 213/243-4000 213/243-4199 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

William J. Baer Richard L. Rosen ARNOLD & PORTER 555 Twelfth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20004 202/942-5000 202/942-5999 (fax)

Stephen A. Mansfield Robert B. Humphreys Timothy G. O'Conner AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD 2029 Century Park East, Suite 2400 Los Angeles, CA 90067 310/229-1000 310/229-1001 (fax)

Gary Halling
James McGinnis
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER
& HAMPTON LLP
Four Embarcadero Center -- 17th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
415/434-9100
415/434-3947 (fax)

Joel S. Sanders GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP One Montgomery Street, 31st Street San Francisco, CA 94104 415/393-8200 415/986-5309 (fax)

William M. Goodman TOPEL & GOODMAN 832 Sansome Street, 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 415/421-6140

Cecil S. Chung
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
2300 N St. NW
Washington, DC 20037
202/663-8000
202/663-8007 (fax)

Terrence A. Callan Albert Boro PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP 50 Fremont Street San Francisco, CA 94105 415/983-1000 415/983-1200 (fax) Robert E. Freitas ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 1000 Marsh Road Menlo Park, CA 94025

William S. Farmer, Jr.
Collette Erickson Farmer & O'Neill LLP
235 Pine Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, California 94104
415/788-4646
415/788-6929 (fax)

Steven H. Morrissett FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 700 Hansen Way Palo Alto, CA 94304 650/849-6600 650/849-6666 (fax)

Robert B. Pringle
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN
& STEINER LLP
101 Second Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94105
415/371-1200
415/371-1211 (fax)

James G. Kreissman Harrison J. Frahn IV Jason M. Bussey SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP 2550 Hanover Street Palo Alto, CA 94304 650/251-5000 650/251-5002 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Aton Arbisser
Julian Brew
Tanja Shipman
KAYE SCHOLER LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90067-6048
310/788-1000
310/788-1200 (fax)

Steven H. Bergman O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071